Orientals in the U. S.

# Japan

## and the

# Gentlemen's Agreement

**The Charge is made by Senator Phelan and others that Japan has been violating it. Do the facts support the charge?**

**Sidney L. Gulick**

Secretary of the

Commission on Relations with the Orient

of the

Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America

105 East 22d Street, New York City

## JAPAN AND THE GENTLEMEN'S AGREEMENT

Senator James D. Phelan and Mr. V. S. McClatchy, both of California, have charged the Japanese Government with violation of the "Gentlemen's Agreement." Senator Phelan appeared before the House Committee on Immigration June 20, 1919, and Mr. McClatchy appeared before the House Committee on September 25th and before the Senate Committee on October 10, 1919. Their statements are recorded in full in the Hearings of these Committees for these dates. The purpose of the following discussion is limited to an evaluation of their charges.

## JAPANESE IMMIGRATION

Japanese immigration began in the eighties of the last century but remained very slight until 1900. In that year it suddenly rose from 1,500 to 2,000 annually to 12,635, of whom about 10,000 came to Continental United States from Hawaii. This was one of the immediate results of the annexation of Hawaii. In 1907 Japanese immigration was 30,226 of whom, however, 9,361 only were admitted to Continental United States. The rapid increase of Japanese men—mostly laborers, many of them from Hawaii, naturally resulted in keen economic competition. No little sharp practice was indulged in on both sides. A vigorous anti-Japanese agitation developed in California calling for laws dealing with Japanese immigration similar to those which had so effectually stopped Chinese immigration thirty years before.

Responsible Japanese, both in and out of the Government, recognized the substantial justice of the demands of California for protection from the evils and dangers of large Japanese immigration. But with their characteristic sensitiveness they felt that Congressional legislation dealing with their people similar to that which was in force against Chinese would be humiliating. Their admiration for America and sense of friendship, made them desire a mutually satisfactory voluntary arrangement without legislation. Such was the economic and psychological background on which the new arrangements were made. Japan undertook in 1907 to stop labor immigration to Continental United States with the understanding that there would be no special anti-Japanese legislation.

## THE GENTLEMEN'S AGREEMENT

The first published statement of that "Agreement" is found in the Report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for 1908 (p. 125), and reads in part as follows:—

"In order that the best results might follow from an enforcement of the regulations, an understanding was reached with Japan that the existing policy of discouraging the emigration of its subjects of the laboring classes to Continental United States should be continued and should, by co-opera-

tion of the Governments, be made as effective as possible. This understanding contemplates that the Japanese Government shall issue passports to Continental United States only to such of its subjects as are non-laborers or are laborers, who, in coming to the continent, seek to resume a formerly acquired domicile, to join a parent, wife, or children residing there, or to assume active control of an already possessed interest in a farming enterprise in this country; so that the three classes of laborers entitled to receive passports have come to be designated 'former residents,' 'parents, wives or children of residents,' and 'settled agriculturists.' With respect to Hawaii, the Japanese Government of its own volition stated that, experimentally at least, the issuance of passports to members of the laboring classes proceeding thence would be limited to 'former residents' and 'parents, wives or children of residents.' The said Government has also been exercising a careful supervision over the subject of the emigration of its laboring class to foreign contiguous territory."

In his Report for 1919 (p. 55), Mr. Caminetti makes the following statement:

"It will be remembered that the passport agreement, which was made in 1907, provides, in effect, that Japan will not issue passports good for Continental United States to laborers, unless such laborers are coming to resume a formerly acquired domicile; to join a parent, husband, or children; or to assume active control of an already possessed interest in a farming enterprise in this country. While the agreement relates only to immigration to Continental United States, Japan soon voluntarily extended the same provisions to the movement to Hawaii, so that in effect all immigration of Japanese laborers is subject to its terms. Non-laborers, of course, are not affected and are free to come and go under the same conditions which obtain in the case of aliens of other nationalities."

This is the "Agreement" which Senator Phelan and Mr. McClatchy charge Japan with having violated.

## THE SPECIFIC CHARGES

"I want to demonstrate to the Committee," says Mr. McClatchy, "that the spirit and the letter of the 'Gentlemen's Agreement' have been grossly violated and continuously violated, and that it is not only the citizens of Japan who are responsible for that violation, but it is Japan herself, because these violations could not have been possible without her active support, if not direct order" (House Hearings, p. 244). He specifies three methods of violation.

(1) "By the admission of labor," (2) "In the matter of picture brides," (3) "By the births in this country through the importation of picture brides,—in contrast with the results seen in the Chinese who are here."

"Since the Gentlemen's Agreement in 1907 the Japanese population in California," he says, "has increased 50,000, most of whom are laborers; and everyone who is a laborer, or who was a laborer is an instance of direct violation on the part of Japan of the Gentlemen's Agreement. . . . Each year there are being admitted from 10,000 to 12,000 Japanese. They cannot come in without the certificate of Japan, as I understand, that they are not laborers. Within a few weeks after they arrive they are at labor, not all but a great portion of them, and everyone that does labor, whether within two

weeks or in a year, is an instance of a direct violation on the part of Japan of her pledged word as a gentleman" (ibid, p. 247). "Under the head of 'picture brides' there have been admitted in less than five years past 20,323 women who labor—not all, but most of them labor" (p. 250). "Usually they will give birth once a year, or nearly once a year to children. The result is that we have in California in the neighborhood of 25,000 native-born Japanese and they are being born at the rate of 4,500 and 5,000. There you have in those methods the plan by which Japan deliberately and carefully violates the 'Gentlemen's Agreement' and adds to the population in this country, while the Chinese on the other hand have been steadily decreasing" (p. 251).

"In Sacramento city the official records of the Health Department show that the birth-rate among the Japanese is five times as great per thousand as among the whites and that proportion, I am told, holds quite general in communities where the Japanese have concentrated" (p. 252).

"I have here," said Senator Phelan, "the number of these picture brides that are coming into the United States. I will give you the aggregate: From 1915 to 1919, the United States, mainland, 13,913; in Hawaii, 6,864; total for the United States, 20,877" (p. 190).

"The shiploads that are coming in—I call them shiploads, but I mean the number of brides who are coming in on the frequently arriving ships in San Francisco are progressively increasing all the time, and the Japanese press exhorts them—'Now, hurry up while the running is good.' They fear there will be some restriction, and they are rushing over the border and through the ports where that is permissible, as in the case of these picture brides, their men and their women."

"Mr. Raker. That means, Senator, does it not, that within a year after their arrival there is a native Japanese born who can obtain title to real estate, and they are immediately conveying real estate to those infant children almost as fast as they are born?"

"Senator Phelan. Yes" (p. 191).

"The percentage of white births during the 12 years has decreased thus: In 1906 it was 98.4; then it goes on year by year—the next year, 1907, 1908, etc.—until finally in 1917 it was 90.6. There was a decrease of 8 per cent in the white births during that period. While there was a decrease in the population of white babies, there was a marked increase in Japanese birth registrations, as follows:

"From 1906, the same period, until 1917, as follows: 134; 221; 455; 682; 719; 995; 1,467; 2,215; 2,874; 3,342; 3,721 and 4,108. In less than 10 years there was an increase of 3,000 per cent" (p. 192).

Such are the main charges. What is to be said about them?

## A PRELIMINARY CRITICISM

We note first of all that Mr. McClatchy does not correctly state the plain terms of the agreement. "It was assumed and stated positively" he says, that "she would accomplish through her own efforts

in regard to Japanese exclusion from this country what was being accomplished as to Chinese exclusion under our law." While the Chinese population in America has been decreasing, "the Japanese population in the United States has increased sixfold since 1900" (Hearings, p. 243). Japan, however, never gave such a pledge. Nor has the American Government made any such statement. His charge, therefore, that Japan has "grossly violated" her pledge depends first of all on a serious misstatement by him of the nature of the "Agreement."

## A GENERAL CRITICISM

In general the figures given by Senator Phelan and Mr. McClatchy are seriously misleading. No one would suspect from Mr. McClatchy's statement that the 20,323 "picture brides" he is talking about include those who landed at Hawaii. The total arrivals of all Japanese "females" in Continental United States for the time mentioned (1915-1919) was 18,459; of these the "wives" numbered 13,563. He speaks moreover of immigration at 10,000 to 12,000 yearly. As a matter of fact more than one-third of these go to Honolulu, but he does not indicate it. He gives no hint still further as to how many of those who do arrive in America leave again shortly. The fact is that while the total of Japanese admitted since 1909 (including 1919) amount to 116,728, the total who have departed amount to 97,849, leaving a net gain of 18,879 for the eleven years. Of this number 10,968 are in Continental United States and 8,911 are in the Territory of Hawaii. Official figures completely dispose of Mr. McClatchy's assertion that "Japanese in California had increased by 50,000 since the Gentlemen's Agreement went into effect, most of whom are laborers."

Mr. Caminetti stated to the Senate Committee on Immigration October 10, 1919 (Senate Hearings, p. 31), that during the years 1909-1919, 13,578 more Japanese males had left the United States (including Hawaii) than had entered—a positive diminution therefore of Japanese laborers. Mr. McClatchy apparently does not know this for he constantly gives the impression that practically all the Japanese arriving are laborers and are added to the labor population already here.

## STATISTICS OF THE "PICTURE BRIDE" MOVEMENT

Senator Phelan and Mr. McClatchy are quite specific in their statements about the number of "picture brides" arriving in the United States. Unfortunately they do not state the sources of their figures. The Annual Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration gives no figures as to "picture brides," although figures are given as to the number of "females" admitted year by year and also as to the total number of "wives."

The Japanese Association of California, however, has had access

to the original records of the Immigration Office at San Francisco from which it has compiled the statistics of picture brides admitted at that port. Similar figures have also been compiled for the Port of Seattle.

**Japanese Picture Brides Admitted**
**at**
**San Francisco, California and Seattle, Washington**

| Year | San Francisco | Seattle | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1912 | 879 | | 879 |
| 1913 | 625 | | 625 |
| 1914 | 768 | | 768 |
| 1915 | 823 | 150 | 973 |
| 1916 | 486 | 144 | 630 |
| 1917 | 504 | 206 | 710 |
| 1918 | 520 | 281 | 801 |
| 1919 | 465 | 267 | 732 |
| Total | 5,070 | 1,048 | 6,118 |

So far as the accessible records show, therefore, the number of "picture brides" admitted to Continental United States for the years 1915-1919 amounts to 3,846 instead of 13,913 as alleged by Senator Phelan. The total number of "wives" admitted during the specified years was 13,563. Perhaps the Senator has assumed that all "wives" are "picture brides." Such, however, is not the case.

## CONCERNING PICTURE BRIDES AND THEIR BABIES

A curious and interesting discrepancy exists in all the statements by Senator Phelan and Mr. McClatchy regarding the number of "picture brides" as related to the number of Japanese babies born in California. This remarkable discrepancy is worthy of close attention, for it well illustrates the general character of their charges against Japan.

In the following table we estimate that two-thirds of all "wives" admitted to Continental United States settled in California and also that all "wives" or "picture brides" faithfully carry out the intentions of the Japanese Government—as alleged by Mr McClatchy, each having a child each year. "There you have in those methods" he asserts, "the plan by which Japan deliberately and carefully violates the Gentlemen's Agreement and adds to the population in this country while the Chinese on the other hand have been steadily decreasing" (p. 251). In the following table we make no allowance for some 3,000 wives who reached California before 1909. Under these conditions what should the Japanese births in California have been? The following table tells the story.

## A Comparison of the Alleged and the Actual Births of Japanese in California

| Year | "Wives" Admitted to Continental United States | Wives Settled in California (Estimated) | Estimated Births of Japanese in California | Actual record of Japanese Births in California |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1909 | 665 | 443 | 443 | 682 |
| 1910 | 880 | 586 | 1,029 | 719 |
| 1911 | 1,669 | 1,112 | 2,141 | 995 |
| 1912 | 2,108 | 1,405 | 3,546 | 1,467 |
| 1913 | 2,398 | 1,598 | 5,144 | 2,215 |
| 1914 | 3,015 | 2,010 | 7,154 | 2,874 |
| 1915 | 2,672 | 1,781 | 8,935 | 3,342 |
| 1916 | 2,478 | 1,652 | 10,587 | 3,721 |
| 1917 | 2,397 | 1,598 | 12,185 | 4,108 |
| 1918 | 2,824 | 1,882 | 14,067 | 4,365 |
| 1919 | 3,192 | 2,128 | 16,195 | 4,700* |
| Total | 24,298 | 16,195 | 81,426 | 29,188 |

It is evident from this table that if the wives all have children about "one each year"—at the prolific rate declared by the gentleman from California, the number of Japanese babies born in California should greatly exceed the numbers reported, especially if the 3,000 wives in California in 1909 had also been doing their duty all the time for ten years. Evidently the "brides" are not "breeding" at such a rate as Senator Phelan and Mr. McClatchy say they are and "as the Japanese Government intended," if we may accept the latter's claim to knowledge in this respect. The assertion that Japanese births in the United States show that Japan "deliberately and carefully violates the Gentlemen's Agreement" calls for a good deal of credulity.

### "PICTURE BRIDES" AS LABORERS

The only really plausible part of Mr. McClatchy's charge as to the violation of the Gentlemen's Agreement is that in which he states that "picture brides" are in fact "laborers," whereas the Agreement was specially arranged for the purpose of excluding new laborers. If the Japanese Government did in fact admit those women because they were laborers, then it violated the Agreement. There is, however, so far as appears, not a single item of evidence to that effect. Japanese laborers in America had the right under the Agreement to send for their wives. These women of course belonged to the laboring class. That they should on reaching America promptly go to work with their husbands was not only natural but commendable. The first requisite of a good immigrant is readiness to work—effective economic productiveness. Even in this respect then the charge of violation is captious. It rests on a distorted notion of the terms of the Agreement.

* Estimated.

But it should be noted that the Japanese Government out of deference to American adverse sentiment in regard to "picture bride" marriages, accepting the suggestion of a memorial from the Japanese Association of California announced in November, 1919, that after February, 1920, it would stop issuing passports to "picture brides." This is an important announcement and shows how sincere and earnest the Japanese in California and the Government of Japan are in their desire to do everything reasonable to maintain friendly relations with the United States.

In this connection we may well refer to the fact that for many years Japan has been voluntarily restricting immigration to Mexico, applying to that land also the general principles of the "Gentlemen's Agreement." Indeed Japan's solicitude to do the fair thing by the United States and remove just so far as she possibly can all legitimate cause of complaint, led her, we have been informed, to arrange with the Japanese Steamship Company, Toyo Kisen Kaisha, running to Peru, not to sell passage to Japanese from that land to Mexico, because of the fact that some Japanese had taken that course to smuggle their way into the United States.

## IMPORTANT STATISTICAL FACTS

The Annual Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration in Tables A to E give much important information bearing on the Gentlemen's Agreement. Compiling the figures for the successive years (1909-1919) since the Agreement went into full operation, we arrive at certain surprising as well as interesting facts. The following statements deal only with Continental United States.

Total admittances were 79,738 of whom 49,156 were males and 30,883 were females. Of the total admittances, 35,275 are classified as relatives of residents, namely parents (560), wives (24,298), and children (10,417). Since the total increase of Japanese population by immigration in Continental United States for this period has been only 10,968, it is apparent that either 24,307 (35,275 — 10,968) of those "relatives" have returned to Japan or others who are not relatives have done so.

An interesting item deals with those who enter the United States on the ground that they were "former residents." Of these there were 32,879, of whom 12,108 were laborers. This shows how misleading, not to use any stronger word, are Mr. McClatchy's statements that every Japanese in California who either is or was a laborer is "an instance of direct violation on the part of Japan of the 'Gentlemen's Agreement.'"

## INCREASE OF JAPANESE POPULATION

To prove that Japan has been violating her Agreement Mr. McClatchy states repeatedly that while the Chinese population has been steadily decreasing since 1900, **"the Japanese population has increased sixfold"** (p. 243). His logic is truly remarkable. In the

first place the increase of population since 1900 has nothing whatever to do with it. The Gentlemen's Agreement began to operate only in 1907. To judge even casually whether or not Japan has been carrying out the Agreement, one has only to look at the following figures.

### Immigration to the United States, Including Hawaii

| Before the Gentlemen's Agreement | | After the Gentlemen's Agreement | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1899 | 2,844 | 1908 | 15,803 |
| 1900 | 12,635 | 1909 | 3,111 |
| 1901 | 5,269 | 1910 | 2,720 |
| 1902 | 14,270 | 1911 | 4,520 |
| 1903 | 19,968 | 1912 | 6,114 |
| 1904 | 14,264 | 1913 | 8,281 |
| 1905 | 10,331 | 1914 | 8,929 |
| 1906 | 13,835 | 1915 | 8,613 |
| 1907 | 30,226 | 1916 | 8,680 |
| | | 1917 | 8,991 |
| | | 1918 | 10,213 |
| | | 1919 | 10,064 |

Hasty observation of this table might possibly lead one to think that even under the Gentlemen's Agreement, thousands of Japanese are steadily entering the United States as **new** immigrants especially since 1912. The fact, however, is that since 1909, the first full year in which the Agreement was in complete operation, some 43,203 of the "immigrants" are "former residents" and 59,538 are registered as "relatives of residents." These figures include Japanese arriving in Hawaii. The following table will throw additional light on the situation. It deals exclusively with Continental United States (excluding Hawaii), and includes all those admitted and departed regardless of their classification as "immigrants" or "non-immigrants." This table is compiled from the Annual Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration, Tables A and E.

### Alien Japanese Admitted to and Departed from Continental United States (Excluding Hawaii)

| Year | Admitted | Departed | Net | Former Residents Returning | Wives Admitted | Children Admitted | Laborers with Proper Passport Returning |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1909 | 2,432 | 5,004 | —2,572 | 850 | 665 | 275 | 295 |
| 1910 | 2,598 | 5,024 | —2,426 | 838 | 880 | 268 | 245 |
| 1911 | 4,282 | 5,869 | —1,587 | 1,202 | 1,669 | 513 | 351 |
| 1912 | 5,358 | 5,437 | — 79 | 1,869 | 2,108 | 538 | 602 |
| 1913 | 6,771 | 5,647 | +1,124 | 2,873 | 2,398 | 642 | 1,175 |
| 1914 | 8,462 | 6,300 | +2,162 | 3,852 | 3,015 | 786 | 1,514 |
| 1915 | 9,029 | 5,967 | +3,062 | 4,063 | 2,672 | 1,269 | 1,545 |
| 1916 | 9,100 | 6,922 | +2,178 | 4,150 | 2,478 | 1,326 | 1,695 |
| 1917 | 9,159 | 6,581 | +2,578 | 4,128 | 2,397 | 1,432 | 1,647 |
| 1918 | 11,143 | 7,691 | +3,452 | 4,958 | 2,824 | 1,685 | 1,774 |
| 1919 | 11,404 | 8,328 | +3,076 | 4,096 | 3,192 | 1,685 | 1,265 |
| Total | 79,738 | 68,770 | +10,968 | 32,879 | 24,298 | 10,417 | 12,108 |

A study of this table discloses the fact that from 1913 and onward among the so-called immigrants there were between 3,000 and 4,000 "former residents" who returned annually to the United States and also between 3,000 and 5,000 "relatives" (wives and children). The total increase of Japanese population by immigration for eleven years was only 10,968. Since the large immigration only began in 1900, since it continued unchecked throughout the fiscal year 1907, and since the Gentlemen's Agreement began to have full effect only in 1909, it seems rather absurd for Mr. McClatchy to argue solemnly that because Japanese population increased as he alleges by sixfold between 1900 and 1919, it was evidence of gross violation of the Gentlemen's Agreement.

## JAPANESE POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES

As a base for his charge that the Japanese population increased "sixfold," he calculates that the Japanese population in Continental United States is "well over 150,000" (p. 278). This figure, however, is excessive, as can be easily shown.

The Census of 1910 gives the Japanese population in the United States as 72,157. The increase by immigration, 1911-1919, was 15,966. Japanese children born in California, 1911-1919, were approximately 27,787, of whom some 4,194 probably died, leaving 23,583. The Census of 1910 showed that Japanese children under five years of age in Continental United States exceeded those in California by 42 per cent. If the same ratio still holds then the Japanese children born in Continental United States and surviving in 1919 was approximately 33,487. This is certainly too large because it makes no allowance for those returning to Japan. Combining results, however, we find that Japanese population in Continental United States in 1919 was approximately 121,610.

Mr. McClatchy's estimates are therefore out by about 30,000, a rather serious amount when he uses his estimate as a basis on which to charge Japan with violation of the Gentlemen's Agreement because her population in the United States has increased "sixfold." As a matter of fact, since 1910 it has not doubled. Since July, 1908, at which date the Agreement first went into full operation, the population has increased from about 77,055 to approximately 121,610 or about 60 per cent.

## SENATOR PHELAN'S CHARGES

Senator Phelan attacks the "Gentlemen's Agreement" from another standpoint. He asserts that "there is a very great increase in the number of Japanese coming into Continental United States . . . they come over the border" and thinks that he proves his point by saying that "immigration officials are arresting Japanese coming over the border all the time." "They have arrested as many as 40 in one day, without passports, coming over the border and deported them" (p. 188).

One would suppose from his method of statement that in the course of a year there would certainly be several hundred arrested and deported. The report, however, of the Commissioner General of Immigration shows that in 1919 there were only 134 all told deported and in 1918 but 40. These cases of smuggling, moreover, do not in the least prove violation of the Gentlemen's Agreement by the Japanese Government—they are private individual ventures. The Senator himself says they were "without passports." The fact that Japanese who cannot get passports smuggle their way into America proves rather that the Japanese Government is in fact administering the Agreement faithfully. Since it regards them as not eligible under the Agreement it refuses to give them passports.

But we should remember that Japanese are not the only sinners in respect of smuggling. Chinese have become notorious in this matter. Smugglers come indeed from all lands. Deported aliens for the fiscal year 1919 totalled 2,257, the largest number for a single people being 1,381 Mexicans, and the next being English, with 188.

Senator Phelan charges Japan with "evading" the Gentlemen's Agreement "by the shipment of picture brides into this country." The object, he says, is to "breed" children, who as American-born may become owners of land, which ownership the law denies to the parents. This he says is "a clear evasion of the law." The Senator recognizes that a test case was decided in Riverside in which "the court said that it saw no evidence on the part of the Japanese to evade the law" (p. 192). Should not the Senator attack the courts of his own state rather than the Japanese?

"There is another more favorite way of evading the statute," he says, "and that is by organizing corporations under our lax corporation law . . . they get 45 per cent aliens and 55 per cent citizens." Although he says that he has secured the statistics of such corporations from the Secretary of State and that the situation is "alarming" (p. 193), he does not submit the statistics for scrutiny. They are probably rediculously small. But whatever the statistics may be, if the law specifically provides that corporations may be formed in which aliens may constitute a minority, it is difficult to see how their formation constitutes an "evasion of the law." He says it would be easy to regulate the evil "if the legislative branch would only act" (p. 193). Evidently the "legislative branch" does not regard the evil as alarming as does the Senator.

Senator Phelan submitted to the House Committee on Immigration an important letter of August 28, 1919, from Hon. Wm. Phillips, Acting Secretary of State, in response to his letter inquiring about the effectiveness of the operation of the "Gentlemen's Agreement." The entire letter merits careful study. The following sentences give the general purport. "The present arrangement is working with a fair degree of satisfaction, with the possible exception of the immigration of so-called Japanese picture brides to the United States."

"The authorities who have in charge the administration of the

immigration laws have not found that the Japanese Government is violating the Agreement" (pp. 265-267). The Senator calmly disposes of these statements and of the whole letter by saying that it is "apologetic" and "diplomatic" and that "the Department of State tries to keep on good relations with Japan." Apparently the Senator feels no such need.

Indeed, he frankly stated to the Committee on June 20, that the Administration has been in the past "overawed" by the Japanese. "There has been a certain subservience on the part of the Administration, both the present Administration and other Administrations, in a diplomatic way, to avoid any conflict or any irritation. A very desirable thing to do when your life is not at stake, but you do not put on soft gloves with a man who is making an assault upon you." He then goes on to say that now that we have "behind us a very powerful army and a very powerful fleet, there is no use of mincing things" (p. 183).

We will note but one more extraordinary assertion by Senator Phelan. He claims that he assisted in stopping the purchase by Japanese in Imperial Valley, Mexico, of 800,000 acres of land for $50,000,000 (p. 200). This assertion has been completely discredited by statements from Secretary of Agriculture of Mexico and by statements of the Real Estate Company in Los Angeles which was charged with having planned the deal. He says in the same connection—"that the Japanese have made contracts with Brazil and with Carranza in Mexico and have taken over vast tracts of land and have established great colonies." He offers not a particle of evidence for the statement. But what if they have? Has America any right to forbid it? The assertion implies an utterly vicious theory of the relation of the United States to Mexico and Brazil.

## CONCLUSION

The foregoing examination of the charges by Senator Phelan and Mr. McClatchy that the Japanese Government has been "grossly violating" or even "evading" the "Gentlemen's Agreement" shows that those charges are without foundation.

In 1913, when the mutual irritation of California and Japan was at its height over California's Anti-Alien Land Law, Baron Makino, then Minister of Foreign Affairs, conferred quite fully with Lord Bryce who happened to be in Japan at that time. "Trust America," Lord Bryce said. "Her sense of justice is so keen that in the end she will do the right thing." "This," says Baron Makino, "is the fundamental principle and spirit controlling Japan's attitude to America."

It is for America to see that that trust is justified.